


### Remarks

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that Claims 5-8, 12, 14, 20, 23, 89, 90, 114, and 119 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With the exception of Claim 23 (which has been canceled), this has been done and Applicants believe those claims are therefore allowable. The remaining claims which have not been canceled have been indicated to be allowable except Claim 22. Claim 22 has been amended to depend from Claim 5 which is allowable and therefore Claim 22 should be similarly allowable. The canceled claims, namely 10, 11, 15-17, 23, 41, 43, 49, 51-69, 87, 92, 94-95, 100-113, 115-116, 118, and 120-121, have been canceled in order to allow this application to issue at this time. It should not be assumed that Applicants concede that any of the canceled claims are unpatentable (in fact, Claim 23 was indicated to be allowable). Furthermore, Claims 92 and 100-113 have been assumed to be withdrawn from consideration. Neither the prior Office Action (imposing a restriction and election requirement) nor the present action mentions any of these claims (except Claims 100, 111, and 113 which were deemed to be drawn to inventions other than that selected for prosecution in this case). Accordingly, Applicants believe that those claims have not been examined and have canceled the claims as drawn to a non-elected invention. Several claims have been amended to change the dependency from allowed Claim 117 to allowed Claim 24. This should not change the allowability of these claims. Finally, Claim 122 has been added to parallel allowable Claim 48, but depend from composition Claim 5 rather than a method claim.

Applicants believe that with this, all claims are clearly allowable and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Guy T. Donatiello  
Registration No. 33,167  
Attorney for Applicants

GTD:jr  
(215) 563-1810